BRYAN AND STEVENSON NOTIFIED

Continued from Page 1.

the Senate a treaty which recognized the independence of Cuba, but provided for the cession of the Philippine Islands to the United States, the menace of imperialism became so apparent that many preferred to reject the treaty and risk the ills that might follow rather than take the chance of correcting the errors of the treaty by the independent action of the country.

the independence of Cuba, but provided for the cession of the Philippine Islands to the United States, the menace of imperialism became so apparent that many preferred to reject the treaty and risk the ills that might follow rather than take the chance of correcting the errors of the treaty by the independent action of the country.

THE TREATY WITH SPAIN.

I was among the number of those who believed it better to ratify the treaty and end the war, release the volunteers, remove the excuse for warexpenditures, and then give to the Filipinos the independence which might be forced from Spain by a new treaty. In view of the critteism which my action aroused in some quarters, I take this occasion to re-state the reasons given at that time. I thought it safe to trust the American people to give independence to the Filipinos than trust the accomplishment of that purpose to diplomacy with an unifriendly mation. Lincoin embodied an argument in the question, when he asked, "Can allens make treaties easier than triends can make laws." I believe that we are now in a better position to ware a successful contest against Imperialism than we would have been had the treaty been rejected. With the treaty at the possession of the propose to diplomacy with an unifriendly not to the propose to diplomacy with an unifriend a government by force, and innertally agreement by force in the propose to diplomacy with a unifriend as government by force in the propose to diplomacy with a unifriend as government by force in the propose to diplomacy with a unifriend as government by force in the propose to diplomacy with a unifriend to trust the accomplishment of that purpose to diplomacy with an unifriend speak of the propose to diplomacy with a unifriend speak of the propose to diplomacy with a unifriend speak of the propose to diplomacy with a unifriend speak of the propose to diplomacy with a unifriend speak of the propose to diplomacy with a unifriend speak of the propose to diplomacy with a unifriend speak of the propose to diplomacy wit

and Webster and Clay gave eloquent expression to the universal desire for Grecian independence. In 1896, all parties manifested a lively interest in the success of the Cubans, but now, when a war is in progress in South Africa, which must result in the extension of the monarchial idea, or in the triumph of a republic, the advocates of imperialism in this country dare not say a word in behalf of the Boers.

SYMPATHY FOR THE BOERS, Sympathy for the Boers does not arise from any unfriendliness toward England; the American people are not unfriendly toward the people of any nation. This sympathy is due to the fact that, as stated in our platform, we believe in the principle of self-government and reject, as did our forefathers, the claims of monarchy. If this nation surrenders its belief in the universal application of the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence, it will lose the prestige and influence which it has enjoyed among the nations as an exponent of popular government.

Our opponents, conscious of the weakness of their cause, seek to confuse imperialism with expansion, and have even dared to claim Jefferson as a supporter of their policy. Jefferson spoke so freely and used language with such precision that no one can be ignorant of his views. On one occasion he declared: "If there be one principle more deeply rooted than any other in the mind of every American, it is that we should have nothing to do with conquest." And again he said: "Conquest is not in our principles; it is inconsis-

olutionary days, expressed the same idea in even stronger language when he said;
"Justice is as strictly due between neighbor nations as between neighbor citizens. A highwayman is as much a robber when he plunders in a gang as when singly; and the nation that makes an unjust war is only a great gang."

as when singly; and the nation that makes an unjust war is only a great gang."

Men may dare to do in crowds what they would not dare to do as individuals; but the moral character of an act is not determined by the number of those who join in it. Force can defend a right, but force has never yet created a right. If it was true, as declared in the resolution of intervention, that the Cubans "are, and of right ought to be, free and independent," (language taken from the Declaration of Independence) it is equally true that the Filipinos "are, and of right ought to be, free and independent." The right of the Cubans to freedom was not based upon their proximity to the United States, nor upon the language which they spoke, nor yet upon the race or races to which they belonged. Congress by a practically unanimous vote declared that the principles enunciated at Philadelphia in 1776 were still alive and applicable to the Cubans.

THE CUBANS AND FILIPINOS.

Who will draw a line between the natural rights of the Cubans and the

lands, appropriate their property and kill their people; but it cannot repeal the moral law or escape the punish-ment decreed for the violation of human rights.

Would we tread in the paths of ty-

"Would we tread in the paths of ranny,
Nor reckon the tyrant's cost?
Who taketh another's liberty
His freedom is also lost.
Would we win as the strong have ever won,
Make ready to pay the debt,
For the God who reigned over Babylon
Is the God who is reigning yet."

Is the God who is reigning yet."

Some argue that American rule in the Philippine Islands will result in the better education of the Filipinos. Be not deceived. If we expect to maintain a colonial policy, we shall not find it to our advantage to educate the people. The educated Filipinos are now in revolt against us, and the most ignorant ones have made the least resistance to our domination. If we are to govern them without their consent and give them no voice in determining the taxes which they must pay, we dare not educate them, lest they learn to read the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and mock us for our inconsistency.

ARGUMENTS OF IMPERIALISTS.

injured most by the military burdens which accompany it.

EVILS THE FARMER SHARES.
In addition to the evils which he and the farmer share in common, the laboring man will be the first to suffer if Oriental subjects seek work in the United States: the first to suffer if American capital leaves our shores to employ Oriental labor in the Philippines to supply the trade of China and Japan; the first to suffer from the violence which the military spirit arouses, and the first to suffer when the methods of imperialism are applied to our own government.
It is not strange, therefore, that the labor organizations have been quick to note the approach of these dangers and prompt to protest against both militarism and imperialism.

THE RELIGIOUS ARGUMENT. EVILS THE FARMER SHARES.

THE RELIGIOUS ARGUMENT.

and prompt to protest against both militarism and imperialism.

THE RELIGIOUS ARGUMENT.

The pecuniary argument, though more effective with certain classes, is not likely to be used so often or presented with so much emphasis as the religious argument. If what has been termed the "gun-powder gospel" were used against the Filipinos only, it would be a sufficient answer to say that a majority of the Filipinos are now members of one branch of the Christian church; but the principle involved is one of much wider application and challenges serious consideration.

The religious argument varies in positiveness from a passive belief that Providence delivered the Filipinos into our hands for their good and our glory, to the exultation of the minister, who said that we ought to "thrash the natives (Filipinos) until they understand who we are," and that "every bullet sent, every cannon shot and flag waved means righteousness."

We cannot approve of this doctrine in one place unless we are willing to apply it everywhere If there is poison in the blood of the hand it will ultimately reach the heart. It is equally true that forcible Christianity, if planted under the American flag in the fur-away Orient, will sooner or later be transplanted upon American soil. If true Christianity consists in carrying out in our daily lives the teachings of Christ, who will say that we are commanded to civilize with dynamite and proselyte with the sword? He who would declare the Divine will must prove his authority either by Holy Writ or by evidence of a special dispensation. The command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospei to every creature" has no gatting gun attachment. When Jesus visited a village of Samaria and the people refused to receive Him, some of the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." Suppose he had said: "We will thrash them until they understand who we are, "how different would have been the history of Christianity. Compare, if you will, the swaggering, builtying, brutal doctrine of im